

REMARKS

In response to the amendment of February 24, 2004, the Office has withdrawn the previously applied 35 USC §102(e) rejection of the claims over the Natajaran et al. reference.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Natajaran et al. reference is joined by the Thompson et al. patent, to form a combination that provides the basis of a §103(a) rejection of the pending claims. In support of the §103(a) rejection, the Office states that Natajaran "does not specifically disclose the event of interest that occurs within the database. It falls, therefore, to the secondary reference to Thompson et al. in combination with the Natajaran reference to provide a teaching or a suggestion of a method for asynchronously notifying an application client of an event of interest that occurs within a database, as claimed.

The Office points to Thompson et al.'s topology manager (210 in Fig. 2), the topology database 214, and col. 6, line 13 to col. 7, line 56 and col. 8, lines 8-53 for the teachings that are acknowledged to be missing from the primary reference.

However, inspection of the Thompson et al. patent reveals that the events of interest, as is the case in the primary reference to Natarajan, are events that occur outside of the database, and that these external events are reported to the database, contrary to that required by the claims.

This is made clear in the very passage noted by the Examiner, namely, col. 6, line 13 to col. 7, line 56:

The network monitor 206 transmits and receives data packets to and from the network 118. The network monitor 206 discovers and monitors network topology, as indicated by arrow 208. When network topology changes on the network, the network monitor 206 generates events, or traps (SNMP vernacular), which include an object identifier and object change information. The network monitor 206 can also receive events from other devices, such as a router, in the network 118. The network monitor 206 interacts with the network 118 by way of the network software 124 (FIG. 1), which essentially comprises protocol stacks, corresponding to, for example, IP, TCP, UDP, SNMP, ISO, DCE, SNA, and NW, and which generally implements these protocols and performs validation functions.

Page 10 of 13

Serial No. 09/490,377
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5585

Furthermore, the network monitor 206 populates the topology data base 214 by way of the topology manager 210 and notifies the topology manager 210 of events (topology changes). Finally, it should be noted that U.S. Pat. No. 5,185,860 to Wu, which is incorporated herein by reference, describes an example of a node discovery system which could be employed to implement the network monitor 206 herein. The foregoing monitor focuses upon monitoring events pertaining to changes in topology. Other monitors could be employed in connection with the present invention and directed to monitoring other aspects of the environment, in which case other types of management information might be passed through the monitor and the GNF system 103.

The topology manager 210 manages the topology data base 214, as indicated by bidirectional arrow 216. The topology manager 210 prompts the network monitor 206 to update topology data related to particular events and receives topology updates, as indicated by arrow 212.

The topology data base 214 stores topology data based upon objects, which are used to partition the network for logical reasons. Objects include, for example but not limited to, a network, a segment, a computer, a router, a repeater, a bridge, etc. (Emphasis Added)

Note that the events in Thompson et al. are specifically generated not within a database (and specifically not within topology database 214), but within the network monitor 206: “When network topology changes on the network, the network monitor 206 generates events” Indeed, the passage relied upon in the Office Action as teaching “events of interest that occur within a database” explicitly teaches that the events that are monitored are those related to the network topology, and not to any event that occurs within a database. In fact, Thompson explicitly teaches that the vents are generated outside of the topology database 214! The network monitor of Thompson et al. monitors changes in the topology of the network, and does not monitor changes within the topology database 214. It is submitted that changes within a database do not affect the network topology. What is monitored in Thompson is not events within the database as required by the claims, but events related to changes in the topology (makeup, structure) of the network, and these changes are reported to the topology database 214. As specifically taught in the excerpt above, the topology database stored topology data relating to objects on the network. Examples of such objects are given above: a network, a segment, a computer, a router, a repeater and a bridge.

The network monitor 206 is disclosed to monitor the network topology and to receive events from other devices such as a router in the network. See Col. 6, lines 13-22. The other passage at col. 8, lines 8-53 cited by the Examiner in Thompson et al. does not contradict the above teachings and does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the primary reference, any method of asynchronously notifying an application of an event of interest that occurs within a database, and much less a method as defined by the recited steps. This passage merely explains Thompson's canonical data structure used in the Generic Notifications Framework (GNF).

In short, Thompson et al. teaches to monitor and receive notifications concerning changes to the network, such as the addition of a router, a computer and other network elements. Such changes are either detected by the network monitor 206 or reported by the network objects themselves and stored in the topology database 214. No teaching or suggestion is present in Thompson regarding events or changes that occur within a database that are of interest to one or more application clients, as recited in and required by each of the independent claims.

As the primary reference to Natajara et al. is acknowledged by the Office to fail to teach the notification of events of interest that occur within a database and as the secondary reference fails to teach that which is acknowledged to be missing from the primary reference, it is respectfully submitted that the combination cannot be effective to teach or to suggest the claimed invention. Indeed, neither reference, either considered alone or in combination, teaches or suggests notifying application clients of events of interest that occur within a database. This is because both of these references are concerned only with the notification of events that occur outside of the database and because both of these references only teach that these external events are to be reported to a database. In contrast, each independent claim recites:

detecting an occurrence of the event within the database;
publishing the notification to a data structure referenced by the event name

Page 12 of 13

Serial No. 09/490,377
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5585

upon detecting the occurrence of the event;
retrieving the delivery information and formatting the published notification according to the retrieved delivery information, and
asynchronously delivering the formatted notification to the application client over a network.

he applied combination of references is not effective to support the Office's 103(a) rejection, as the applied combination does not teach the above-listed steps. This is because both constituent references of the combination are drawn to another problem: the detection and dissemination of information regarding events that occur outside the database and the reporting of such external events to a database. The claimed embodiments of the present invention do not report external events to a database. Rather, the claimed embodiments recite detecting the occurrence of events within a database and the asynchronous delivery of a formatted notification regarding the detected events to application clients over the network. The applied combination of references simply does not teach or suggest any such steps or methods.

The present application, therefore, is now believed to be in condition for allowance. In the event that there are any questions relating to this amendment or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions and whatever is needed will be done immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 6, 2004

By: 

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

\\Ylfserver\YLF\CLIENTS\ORCL\55855585 Resp to OA of 050604.doc

Page 13 of 13

Serial No. 09/490,377
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5585